<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 10, 2004. Claims 1 to 21, 23, 24, 27 to 30, 32, 33 and 36 to 38 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 19, 20, 29 and 38 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 21, 23, 24, 27 to 30, 32, 33 and 36 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,291,302 (Gordon) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,043,904 (Nickerson). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns performing processing in a designated order. According to the invention, a user designates an identification name for object information and a process to be performed on the object information. In advance of performing the designated process, the user sets up as an execution condition, a command to be executed when the designated process is performed. For example, a user may set up a command for issuing a notification that the process is completed. The present invention detects whether or not the performed processes matches the designated process and that an identification name related to the object information of the performed process matches the designated identification name, and if so, the set up command is executed.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 1 is an information processing apparatus comprising identification name designation means for designating by a user an identification name related to object information, process designation means for designating by the user a process for the object information, setup means for setting up by the user in advance of performing the process, as an execution condition for a command to be executed, the process designated by the process designation means and the identification

- 13 -

name designated by the identification name designation means, determination means for determining whether or not a performed process matches the designated process and that an identification name related to the object information of the performed process matches the designated identification name, and execution means for executing the command for which the execution condition is set up by the setup means when the determination means determines that the performed process matches the designated process and that the identification name related to the object information of the performed process matches the designated identification name.

Amended independent Claims 10 and 19 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond Claim 1.

Amended independent Claim 20 includes features along the lines of Claim 1, but is more specifically directed to an information processing apparatus comprising identification name designation means for designating by a user an identification name related to a first process, wherein a performance of the first process is employed as an execution condition for a second process to be performed, setup means for setting up by the user in advance of performing the first process, together with the identification name related to the first process designated by the identification name designation means, the second process that is to be performed when the first process has been performed, detection means for detecting that the first process related to the identification name designated by the identification name designation means has been performed, and execution means for performing, when the detection means detects that the first process has been performed, the second process that is set up with the identification name related to the first process.

Amended independent Claims 29 and 38 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 20.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of amended independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 20, 29 and 38. More particularly, with regard to Claims 1, 10 and 19, the applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of executing a command which is set up as an execution condition when it is determined that a performed process matches a process designated by a user and that an identification name related to object information of the performed process matches an identification name designated by the user. Similarly, with regard to Claims 20, 29 and 38, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of, when it has been detected that a first process related to an identification name and which has been employed as an execution condition has been performed, performing a second process that is set up with the identification name related to the first process.

Gordon is merely seen to disclose that an originating facsimile machine 1 transmits a fax document image data, and that a Store and Forward Facility (SAFF) stores the originating machine's identification, a destination machine's telephone number, a fax format, and the document image data (column 7, lines 4-13). The SAFF then generates an "Acceptance Record" of the transaction and delivers the fax message to the destination machine (column 7, lines 15-20). In Gordon, when delivery is successful, a "Delivery Record" is sent to the originating SAFF and then to the originating machine 1 (column 9, lines 1-15). If the destination machine's line is busy or the delivery fails, a "Retry Record" is sent back to the SAFF and then on to the originating machine 1 (column 9, lines 16-40). Gordon's only apparent teaching regarding a user set up relates to the user keying in a Message Code when they select a "failed-connection message disposition" choice. In this case, the user is presented with a menu of disposition options to select from with a keypad (column 10, lines 3-17). However, as readily conceded in the Office Action, Gordon fails

to disclose or to suggest the set up means/step as claimed in the present invention. Accordingly, Gordon also cannot perform the claimed execution process.

The Office Action, however, alleges that Nickerson, when combined with Gordon, would have rendered the present invention obvious. As Applicants understand Nickerson, it merely discloses the transmission of job status information from one remote receiving station to another. However, Applicants fail to see anything in Nickerson in which the performance of one process in Nickerson, and in particular, the performance of a job status notification process, invokes the execution of a second process. Accordingly, any permissible combination of Gordon and Nickeson still would not have resulted in at least the feature of executing a command which is set up as an execution condition when it is determined that a performed process matches a process designated by a user and that an identification name related to object information of the performed process matches an identification name designated by the user (as claimed in Claims 1, 10 and 19), or at least the feature of, when it has been detected that a first process related to an identification name and which has been employed as an execution condition has been performed, performing a second process that is set up with the identification name related to the first process (as claimed in Claims 20, 29 and 38).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, amended independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 20, 29 and 38, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

No other matters having been raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 87254v1

- 17 -